

**REMARKS**

In response to the previous Office Action which had suggested the claims would be allowable when changed to overcome a Section 112 rejection, applicant amended the claims after discussion with the Examiner. For example, the optional gear assembly was made mandatory in the then pending independent claim and a new independent claim without this element was submitted. No claim changes are being proposed in this response because of the "final" status of the Office Action. Nevertheless, the applicant stands ready to make appropriate changes and respectfully requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned if the Examiner has any suggestions he believes will put this case into condition for allowance. For example, if it is believed some alternative to the "a mechanism consisting of" language which was deleted in the last amendment would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate what that alternative constitutes.

Claims 4, 8, 9, 22-24 and 26-29 under 35 USC § 102 over Sponable. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Claims 19, 20 and 25 have been rejected over Sponable in view of Manuel and claim 21 over Sponable in view of Hopper. All of these rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to a power window device for raising and lowering the window which is fitted on the lock of the motor vehicle door. The assembly comprises a vehicle door including an inner panel having opposed vertical disposed edges, a vehicle lock, a window pane, a pair of guiding rails and a window pane drive mechanism which moves the window pane between positions. The window pane drive mechanism consists of a motor, two pulleys whose shafts are directly mounted to the inner panel of the door, a driver, a single drive cable which traverses only the two pulleys and

the driver to form a triangular loop, and a support which is mounted on the window pane and also fixed on a portion of the cable at a point between the two pulleys. The claimed window pane drive mechanism may or may not also contain a gear assembly.

There are numerous differences between Sponable and the claimed invention. Sponable does not disclose a vehicle lock and the window pane drive mechanism is also very different. That complicated mechanism includes, *inter alia*, a pair of pulleys within housings, a cable encased within a sheath 62a for most of its run and not encased in the remainder, three supports of which two (40, 42) are mounted on a window and the third (44) is mounted on a cross-rail, a first angle arm riding in slots 40a and 44a of supports 40 and 44, and a second angle arm one end of which rides in a slot 42a of support 42 and the other end of which is pivotally fixed to lug 38 which, in turn, is fixed to the cross-rail.

Sponable's pulleys 80 and 84 are mounted to housings 78 and 82 (column 3, lines 28-31), but there is no indication that their shafts are directly mounted to the inner panel of the vehicle door. Cable 60 is helically wrapped in a helical groove 72a of drum 72 (column 3, lines 34-36) so that the cable run is partly triangular and partly helical. There is no support which is mounted on the window pane and at the same time, fixed to the cable between the pulleys. Instead, Sponable has two supports 40 and 42 mounted on the window pane and neither of those are fixed to the cable. What is fixed to the cable is the support element 88 of pivot axis assembly 50, about which element crossed upwardly angled lever arms can pivot, as shown in Figure 2. The lever arms themselves are also not fixed to the supports 40, 42 but instead ride in slots 40a, 42a in those supports. Figure 4 shows the shape of the cable loop changes as the scissor assembly is operated. In addition, as to the present claim 23, Sponable includes a gear assembly.

Sponable's window regulator is very different from the construction of the present invention which is intended to eliminate the vertical guide rail found in conventional roller cable power window devices, to fix the guide pulleys directly to the inner panel of the vehicle and to provide a simple structure. The anticipation rejection is therefore not tenable. There are radical changes which need to be made in Sponable's regulator in order to realize the claimed invention but there is nothing in the record to suggest those changes to the skilled person in the art.

The Manuel reference has been cited to show springs but not to otherwise cure the basic deficiencies in Sponable discussed above. Moreover, there is nothing in Sponable suggest tensioning is needed or desired. The very complicated arrangement in Manuel which includes springs would introduce a level of complexity into Sponable's already complex arrangement which is directly contrary to the simplicity sought in the claimed invention. Further, even if the springs were imposed on Sponable, the resulting combination would not be the claimed invention.

Hopper also is not asserted to cure the basic deficiencies in Sponable, and it does not in fact do so. It has been cited only to show a lock assembly interconnected to a drive mechanism. It is respectfully submitted that it is not obvious to a person skilled in the art how to provide the Sponable scissor assembly interconnected with the lock assembly taught by Hopper, and even if it was, the resulting construction would still be completely different from that claimed in this application. The Office Action suggests that installing a single unit would decrease installation time and simplify installation adjustments but how a single installable unit containing the vehicle lock interconnected to the window pane drive mechanism would be constructed is not set forth in the Office Action nor is it

apparent. It is respectfully submitted that this is an after-the-fact justification but it does not serve to make the combination obvious.

In view of the above comments, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Edward A. Meilman/  
Edward A. Meilman  
Registration No.: 24,735  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant